

concerted action to reduce health inequalities are timely. These efforts should not remain restricted to policies implemented within member states of the European Union and should also stimulate and contribute to tackling health inequality across countries and beyond the union's borders.

Ilona Koupil *professor of health equity studies*

Centre for Health Equity Studies (CHES), Stockholm University/Karolinska Institutet, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden (ilona.koupil@chess.su.se)

I thank Denny Vågerö and Olle Lundberg for helpful discussions and comments.

Competing interests: None declared.

- 1 Leon DA, Walt G, Gilson L. International perspectives on health inequalities and policy. *BMJ* 2001;322:591-4.
- 2 Department of Health. *Tackling health inequalities: a programme for action*. 2003. www.dh.gov.uk/assetRoot/04/01/93/62/04019362.pdf (accessed 10 Oct 2005)
- 3 Nobelprize.Org. Press release: the 2005 Nobel Prize in physiology or medicine. <http://nobelprize.org/medicine/laureates/2005/press.html> (accessed 8 Oct 2005)

- 4 Mitchell H, Mégraud F. Epidemiology and diagnosis of *Helicobacter pylori* infection. *Helicobacter* 2002;7(Suppl 1):8-16.
- 5 Czinn SJ. *Helicobacter pylori* infection: detection, investigation, and management. *J Pediatr* 2005;146:S21-6.
- 6 Fall CHD, Goggin PM, Hawtin P, Fine D, Duggleby S. Growth in infancy, infant feeding, childhood living conditions, and *Helicobacter pylori* infection at age 70. *Arch Dis Child* 1997;77:310-4.
- 7 Oona M, Utt M, Nilsson I, Uibo O, Vorobjoba T, Maaros HI. *Helicobacter pylori* infection in children in Estonia: decreasing seroprevalence during the 11-year period of profound socioeconomic changes. *Helicobacter* 2004;9:233-41.
- 8 Vyse AJ, Gay NJ, Hesketh LM, Andrews NJ, Marshall B, Thomas HI, et al. The burden of *Helicobacter pylori* infection in England and Wales. *Epidemiol Infect* 2002;128:411-7.
- 9 Leinsalu M, Vågerö D, Kunst AE. Increasing ethnic differences in mortality in Estonia after the collapse of the Soviet Union. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2004;58:583-9.
- 10 Leinsalu M, Vågerö D, Kunst AE. Estonia 1989-2000: enormous increase in mortality differences by education. *Int J Epidemiol* 2003;32:1081-7.
- 11 Koupilova I, Rahu K, Rahu M, Karro H, Leon DA. Social determinants of birthweight and length of gestation in Estonia during the transition to democracy. *Int J Epidemiol* 2000;29:118-24.
- 12 Kuh D, Power C, Blane D, Bartley M. Socioeconomic pathways between childhood and adult health. In: Kuh D, Ben-Shlomo Y, eds. *A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004: 371-95.

Complementary therapies and the NHS

Uncertain evidence of cost effectiveness should not exclude complementary medicine from reviews and guidelines

In the early 20th century, scientific medicine emerged as the dominant model for health care in the West. Yet, despite the successes of scientific medicine, people have continued to seek treatments outside mainstream services.¹ In the United Kingdom about one in 10 of the adult population consults a CAM (complementary and alternative medicine) practitioner every year, and 90% of this contact happens outside the NHS.²

Why do people turn to these therapies? Persistent symptoms and the real or perceived adverse effects of conventional treatments are the main reasons.^{w1} Patients value complementary practitioners viewing their predicament "as a whole" and not through the fragmenting lens of clinical specialisation or within the time pressured environment of primary care.^{w2}

The popularity of a clinical method should not, however, be confused with its value. The popularity of CAM may simply reflect the limitations of conventional treatments. In the past 20 years there has been substantial research on its effectiveness. By March 2004 the Cochrane Collaboration had 145 completed reviews of randomised controlled trials of complementary and alternative therapies: a third showed a positive or possibly positive effect, although over half found insufficient evidence to make such judgments.³

This work has met with resistance from CAM practitioners.^{w3} Many of the methodological objections they raise (the individualising of treatments, the integrity of the practitioner-patient relationships, the subtle and long term outcomes expected) are shared by complex interventions for chronic conditions within mainstream health care.⁴ Methodological responses have included pragmatic trial designs, nested qualitative studies, and the use of real world observational data to create an "evidence house."⁵

With finite resources, the case for CAM in the NHS will be judged on economic grounds. But the growth in evidence on clinical effectiveness for some complementary and alternative treatments is not matched by evidence of cost effectiveness. This is the main conclusion one can draw from Canter and colleagues' short report in this issue (p 880).⁶ Looking for randomised studies of complementary or alternative therapies done in the United Kingdom, the authors could locate only five papers for review, four of which reported trials of spinal manipulation. Though the review does not formally assess study quality, it reports that manipulation may be cost effective. In its narrow focus, however, the report fails to address the complexities of cost effectiveness studies in complementary and alternative medicine.⁷

By contrast, the multi-method inquiry by Smallwood published last week spawned a broad, if not sprawling report.⁸ Smallwood was commissioned by the Prince of Wales to investigate whether CAM could save the NHS money in the treatment of chronic conditions. His findings are based on a literature review of studies from the United Kingdom of the big five CAM traditions (acupuncture, homoeopathy, chiropractic, osteopathy, and herbal medicine),⁹ costing case studies of the provision of CAM in primary care, and interviews with favourably disposed stakeholders.

The report is not clear about the method of the unsystematic literature review and contains no explicit appraisal of study quality nor synthesis of data on cost. Owing to a paucity of data, Smallwood does not reach any definitive conclusions about the cost effectiveness of CAM but does identify potential savings. For example, a week's supply of St John's wort, with effectiveness

Papers p 880



Additional references w1-w3 are on bmj.com

BMJ 2005;331:856-7

equivalent to paroxetine,¹⁰ costs only 82p, compared with £1.62 for paroxetine. His case studies suggest that complementary and alternative programmes can lead to savings in direct costs, but these savings will be greatly diminished or abolished when set against the overall costs of providing these services. The provision of specific complementary and alternative interventions by members of existing primary healthcare teams might offer scope for cost savings in such settings.

The report concludes that complementary and alternative therapies should be targeted at the “effectiveness gaps” of conventional health care,¹¹ particularly in managing chronic pain and mental disorders, and in palliative care. We think this is a useful concept but were perplexed by Smallwood including asthma, for which conventional treatment is generally effective and safe.

Despite its limitations and the likelihood of bias in its conclusions, we believe that the Smallwood report fulfils a useful political function. It should promote more investment in research on the cost effectiveness of complementary and alternative treatments. Nevertheless, the report’s principal recommendation—that NICE (the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence) carries out a full assessment of the cost effectiveness of these therapies—is ill advised.

A more sensible recommendation to NICE would be that, in developing the scope of new guidelines on chronic conditions, the institute pays greater attention to reviewing complementary therapies. Therapists with particular expertise in complementary and alternative treatments for each specific condition should be invited to join guideline development groups. These groups can wrestle with the philosophical and methodological dilemmas over what study designs should be included in the evidence base of the guidelines. Uncertain evidence of effectiveness does not preclude a positive recommendation in a guideline, and original modelling of cost effectiveness can be part of guideline development.¹²

Lastly, those making decisions about integrated medicine in the NHS should consider each complementary or alternative therapy on its merits, using a

broad range of appropriate scientific evidence including data on cost effectiveness. Such decision making, if done transparently, may change the public perception of scientific medicine for the better.

Trevor Thompson *clinical lecturer*

Academic Unit of Primary Care, University of Bristol, Bristol BS6 6JL

Gene Feder *professor of primary care research and development*

Centre for Health Sciences, Barts and the London, Queen Mary’s School of Medicine and Dentistry, London E1 4AT (g.s.feder@qmul.ac.uk)

Competing interests: GF was paid by Weleda to chair a guideline development group on the use of mistletoe as a cancer treatment and by NICE to chair two guideline development groups.

- 1 Kaptchuk TJ, Eisenberg DM. Competing medical systems in North America. *Varieties of healing. 1: medical pluralism in the United States. Ann Intern Med* 2001;135:189-95.
- 2 Thomas KJ, Nicholl JP, Coleman P. Use and expenditure on complementary medicine in England: a population based survey. *Complement Ther Med* 2001;9:2-11.
- 3 Manheimer E, Berman B, Dubnick H, Beckner W. Cochrane reviews of complementary and alternative therapies: evaluating the strength of the evidence. 2004. www.cochrane.org/colloquia/abstracts/ottawa/P-094.htm (accessed 10 Oct 2005).
- 4 Campbell M, Fitzpatrick R, Haines A, Kinmonth AL, Sandercock P, Spiegelhalter D, et al. Framework for design and evaluation of complex interventions to improve health. *BMJ* 2000;321:694-6.
- 5 Jonas WB. The evidence house: how to build an inclusive base for complementary medicine. *West J Med* 2001;175:79-80.
- 6 Canter PH, Coon JT, Ernst E. Cost effectiveness of complementary treatments in the United Kingdom: systematic review. *BMJ* 2005;331:880-1.
- 7 Hulme C, Long AF. Square pegs and round holes? A review of economic evaluation in complementary and alternative medicine. *J Altern Complement Med* 2005;11:179-88.
- 8 Smallwood C. *The role of complementary and alternative medicine in the NHS*. London: FreshMinds, 2005. www.freshminds.co.uk/PDF/THE%20REPORT.pdf (accessed 10 Oct 2005).
- 9 House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology. *Complementary and alternative medicine*. London: Stationery Office, 2000. www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/ld199900/ldselect/ldscitech/123/12301.htm (accessed 10 Oct 2005).
- 10 Szegei A, Kohnen R, Dienel A, Kieser M. Acute treatment of moderate to severe depression with hypericum extract WS 5570 (St John’s wort): randomised controlled double blind non-inferiority trial versus paroxetine. *BMJ* 2005;330:503.
- 11 Fisher P, van HR, Hardy K, Berkovitz S, McCarney R. Effectiveness gaps: a new concept for evaluating health service and research needs applied to complementary and alternative medicine. *J Altern Complement Med* 2004;10:627-32.
- 12 National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *Incorporating health economics in guidelines and assessing resource impact. Guideline development methods: information for national collaborating centres*. London: NICE 2005. www.nice.org.uk/pdf/GDM_Allchapters_0305.pdf (accessed 10 Oct 2005).

Keeping healthy on a minimum wage

Is not easy in the United Kingdom

The national minimum wage was a flagship policy of the United Kingdom’s Labour party during the 1997 election campaign—a century after Fabians Sidney and Beatrice Webb first advanced the idea.¹ From April 1999 the policy set a main minimum wage of £3.60 per hour for those aged 22 and older and a lower rate of £3.00 for those aged 18-21. Reviewed annually, the main rate now stands at £5.05 and the youth rate at £4.25 per hour. People aged 25 or over and working at least 30 hours a week can also receive working tax credits after means testing. Has the policy reduced poverty and, in turn, improved public health?

The minimum wage and working tax credits are important policies in the government’s anti-poverty strategy. Yet the latest estimate shows that wages in

250 000 jobs held by people aged 18 or over in the United Kingdom are still below the minimum rates.² Furthermore, although these “welfare to work” policies stemmed from beliefs in social justice and in “making work pay,” the overall effect of the minimum rates on income inequality appears small.^{3 4}

The national minimum wage and working tax credits have raised the earnings of the lowest paid workers. However, progress towards a minimum income for healthy living has been slow and patchy. The health community did not participate in decisions on setting minimum incomes and calculations to set the rates did not consider requirements for personal health.^{5 6}

Arguing that policies on social welfare should take account of the minimum income needed to maintain